

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, 24 and 26-29 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Status of Office Action

The Office Action Summary states that the Office Action is final and also states that the Office Action is non-final. Attempts to reach the Examiner for clarification were unsuccessful. The body of the Office Action does not mention that the Office Action is final. However, the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) page on the USPTO Website indicates that the Office Action is non-final. See attached printout. Therefore, Applicants assume that the action is non-final. If, however, the Office Action is indeed final, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants at the below listed number to rectify the situation.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, 24 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Judd et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,215) in view of *Snyder* (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,641). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the prior art when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this particular case, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the presently claimed invention.

Judd teaches a method and apparatus for retrieving documents based on information other than document content. In *Judd*, a search engine generates an index for documents and adds tag words to the index when matches are found. Thereafter, the search engine of *Judd* executes searches against the index, rather than the actual content of the document. See *Judd*, Abstract.

In contradistinction, the present invention provides a mechanism for searching a Web page responsive to receiving a single input string, wherein the input string includes a

universal resource identifier of the Web page and a search string. *Judd* does not teach or suggest parsing an input string for a universal resource identifier and a search string and searching for the information corresponding to the search string through a Web page identified by the universal resource identifier, as recited in claim 1. More particularly, *Judd* does not teach or suggest that a universal resource identifier and a search string are separated from each other in the input string by a selected delimiter," as recited in claim 1.

To the contrary, *Judd* teaches using tag words and document specifications to search Web pages. In col. 9, lines 1-35, which is cited in the Office Action as allegedly teaching the claim limitations, *Judd* states:

A tag word is any character string that is to be associated with a document for search purposes. Often, the tag words are dedicated code words, or words that are not normally found in a document or dictionary, although this characteristic is not required. Examples of tag words include "n2h2/black" and "n2h2/white", as shown by tag words 138a, 138c of FIG. 3. Other tag words may be properties or meta-information such as the title of a document, abstract, or others, as described further below. For example, a tag word may be "ADVERTISEMENT" to indicate that its associated Web page(s) contain advertising. A tag word may be "VERIFIED" to indicate that its associated Web page(s) contain factual information that has been verified by some independent third party.

Each of the document specifications 132 specifies a matching criteria. The documents that satisfy the matching criteria are specified in a document specification associated, in the index, with the tag word 134 of the record having that document specification. A document specification 132 may, for example, an expression that identifies the location of a document in a network, such as a URL.

In a preferred embodiment, the document specification may be expressed in a wildcard format. Using a wildcard format for the document specification allows a particular tag word to be associated with more than one URL, without requiring each URL to be identified literally. Document specifications 136a-136c of FIG. 3 are expressed in wildcard format. For example, document specification 136a is http://*.hotsex.com/. The "*" character in document specification 136a indicates that the document

specification includes any server within the domain "hotsex.com". When the process of FIG. 2 processes document specification 136a, the code word 138a will be associated in the index 16 with any indexed document having a location identifier that matches document specification 136a, as explained further below.

There is no teaching in the cited portion, or any other portion, of *Judd* of parsing an input string for a universal resource identifier and a search string. The Office Action proffers no analysis as to why tag words and document specifications are somehow equivalent to an input string that includes a universal resource identifier and a search string. The Office Action also fails to explain how *Judd* somehow teaches searching for the information corresponding to the search string through a Web page identified by the universal resource identifier that is provided in the input string, as recited in claim 1.

Rather, *Judd* teaches receiving a typical search string (query) that contains one or more words. See col. 8, lines 22-29. There is no teaching whatsoever in *Judd* of an input string in which a universal resource identifier and a search string are separated from each other by a selected delimiter, as recited in claim 1. The Office Action provides no analysis as to why *Judd* somehow teaches this feature other than to cite a seemingly arbitrary portion of the reference that describes a wildcard being used in a URL in a document specification.

Snyder teaches a Web search engine with graphic snapshots. The cited portion of *Snyder* states:

The search engine 20 of the invention accepts user queries that characterize files of interest, searches for the files and reports to each such user the results of the search including network addresses of the files found to at least partly meet the query, enabling the user to link directly to the files, and also a snapshot of how the file will appear according to the most recent rendering performed by the crawler of the search engine.

Thus, *Snyder* teaches receiving an input string and returning network addresses. *Snyder* does not teach or suggest parsing an input string for a universal resource identifier and a search string and searching for the information corresponding to the search string through a Web page identified by the universal resource identifier, as recited in claim 1. More

particularly, *Snyder* also does not teach or suggest that a universal resource identifier and a search string are separated from each other in the input string by a selected delimiter," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that *Snyder* teaches locating a search object on the Web page and using the search object to search for the information on col. 10, lines 39-67, and col. 13, lines 31-61. Applicants respectfully disagree. *Snyder* does not teach an input string that includes a universal resource identifier and a search string; therefore, *Snyder* cannot possibly teach locating a search object on the Web page identified in the input string.

A cited portion of *Snyder* states:

The search portal 78 that performs the search by reference to the database 62 in storage media 64, reports the search by composing a web page containing the search results, assembling the search report using hypertext markup language. The search report contains headers and information identifying the portal and perhaps contains advertising. The search report also lists the hits that resulted from the search. More particularly, the search engine inserts (in list or table form) a text string showing the URL address of each web page hit (i.e., the pages found to meet the user criteria) together with a hypertext linkage to that URL (e.g., an "href=" statement), causing the user's browser to show a link that can be invoked (pointed and clicked) to load the page at the stated address. Such a report is conventional in an html source search report. It typically also has a description or excerpt and may be arranged in a pyramid or hierarchy of categories. According to the foregoing inventive aspect, the search engine also inserts the URL address of the graphic file that has been processed by a further process identified in FIG. 2 as Web Agent B 95, to contain a snapshot reduced/compressed graphic 35 representing the page hit.

The link to the compressed rendered graphic file can be made, for example, by use of a IMG SRC=<domain>/<path><filename> command in the html source. The graphic can be associated with a hypertext link to the hit page URL as well as linking using an HREF=<URL of hit page> command as mentioned above. As a result, the user's browser when displaying the search results also displays the graphic snapshot image, as shown in FIG. 3.

Snyder, col. 10, lines 39-67. This cited portion merely teaches that the search report that is returned from the search engine includes URL addresses of Web pages that match the search query. Another cited portion of *Snyder* states:

The search/reporting steps of the browser, generally shown in FIG. 3, include accepting search criteria 54 from user 30, for example using a CGI script technique in which the user enters selections including text strings, literal strings of plural terms, additional encoded aspects such as media types, date windows or limits, countries of origin, etc. The user may also select Boolean relationships (AND, OR, NOT, XOR). The search portal may require commands or may permit selection using point-and-click steps. The search engine compares the search criteria to the pre-prepared database of information gleaned from the web pages it has loaded and analyzed from the field. The results are reported to the user by preparing and formatting an html source reporting page into which hyperlinks are entered that name and point to the addresses of the files that were found to meet the criteria. Often the report includes other information such as the date the page was last updated before it was indexed, and a few lines of introductory text from the page, which provide a hint to assist the user in determining without loading the page whether the page is likely to be relevant to the search. If the user finds a link that appears to be pertinent, the user selects and engages the hyperlink. This causes the browser to load the html source found at the URL address shown in the search report, and any referenced files and links therein. However, the page may have changed between the time that the indexing was accomplished and may have totally different content than it had when indexed. The page may no longer exist. In those cases, the search fails except to advise the user that the page formerly held information that might have been of interest.

Again, the cited portion of *Snyder* makes no mention whatsoever of locating a search object on the Web page identified in an input string and using the search object from the Web page to search for the information. The Office Action simply cited seemingly arbitrary, albeit lengthy, portions of the reference without explaining how the teachings are somehow equivalent to the claimed features. For the above reasons, the applied references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or fairly suggest each and every

claim limitation. Therefore, the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Moreover, *Snyder* teaches away from the present invention because *Snyder* teaches search engine portals that have proprietary "robots" that crawl the Web. See *Snyder*, col. 14, line 66, to col. 16, line 27. That is, *Snyder* expressly teaches performing a search using a search engine portal that provides a proprietary search object to search other Web pages, rather than locating a search object on a specific Web page that is identified in an input string and using the search object of the specific Web page to perform the search. Using the search engine portal of *Snyder* would result in the same proprietary search object being used regardless of the Web page(s) being searched.

Furthermore, *Snyder* is not concerned with searching a specific Web page that is identified in an input string. Rather, the search engine portal is used to provide a gateway to all known Web pages and the "robots" are used to expand the breadth of the search. The search engine portal of *Snyder* is not equivalent to the presently claimed invention, which receives an input string that includes a universal resource identifier of a Web page and a search string and searches for the information corresponding to the search string **through the Web page identified by the universal resource identifier.**

Independent claims 11, 12, 22, 24, and 26-29 recite subject matter addressed above with respect to claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Since claims 3-10 and 14-21 depend from claims 1 and 12, the same distinctions between *Judd* and *Snyder* and the invention recited in claims 1 and 12 apply for these claims. In addition, claims 3-11, 14-22, 24, and 26-29 recite additional combinations of features not taught or suggested by the applied references.

With respect to claims 10 and 21, the Office Action states:

Regarding claims 10 and 21, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 12 above, respectively. In addition, Judd/Snyder discloses: wherein the selected delimiter is at least one of a "\$", "o", "*", and "#" (col. 10, lines 60 to col. 11, lines 61, Judd).

Office Action, dated February 12, 2004. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of *Judd* describes a wildcard format for document specifications. Nowhere in the cited portion of *Judd*, or any portion of either applied reference, does the prior art teach a delimiter for separating a universal resource identifier and a search string. The Office

Action proffers no analysis whatsoever as to why a wildcard in a document specification is somehow equivalent to a delimiter in an input string, wherein the delimiter separates a universal resource identifier and a search string, as in the claimed invention. *Snyder* does not solve the deficiencies of *Judd*. The applied references, taken alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Therefore, the proposed combination of *Judd* and *Snyder* cannot render claims 10 and 21 obvious.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, 24 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.


III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Tkacs
Reg. No. 46,430
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Agent for Applicants

Attachment: PAIR printout